

Intelligence Analysis for Homeland Security
Gary Shiffman and Jennifer Sims, Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University

This project will examine how traditional intelligence analysis practices and concerns should be modified for the homeland security mission in particular to support risk analysis modeling and resource allocation decision making with regard to the terrorism threat.

Other Proposed Investigators - Bruce Berkowitz (Hoover), Robin L. Dillon-Merrill (Georgetown), Bruce Hoffman (Georgetown/West Point), and Daniel Byman (Georgetown/Brookings).

Brief Description - The purpose of this research is to improve intelligence analysis related to threats to homeland security, with an emphasis on the usefulness to assessing risks and allocating counterterrorism resources.¹ In particular, this research will explore how traditional intelligence analysis methods do and do not apply to the homeland security challenge of assessing threat. It will also examine the role of counterintelligence analysis and the interaction of analysis with the policy community and with the risk modeling community. Foreign “best practices” will be examined, as will the opportunities and challenges of grassroots intelligence analysis and dissemination of analytic products beyond the federal level. This effort will also integrate with other CREATE projects that require the assessments of threats for modeling risks and allocating counterterrorism resources.

Objectives - This research will (a) develop one or more sets of guidelines for homeland security intelligence analysts working on terrorism; (b) propose alternative models based on foreign governments’ best practices; (c) assess the role of counterintelligence analysis in relation to the broader risk context related to terrorism; (d) identify the role of state, local, and “grassroots” intelligence providers and analysts in the entire process; and (e) identify challenges for intelligence analysts working on terrorism in communicating their research to the homeland security policy “consumer” and in integrating with risk models.

Interfaces to other Center Projects - This work will maintain a close interface with Dr. von Winterfeldt’s risk analysis and economics projects specifically focusing on the areas of other CREATE projects that require the assessment of threats. In particular, chemical and biological weapons, explosives, borders and maritime security, and infrastructure threats have been identified as primary study areas for the next three years for CREATE.

Interfaces to non-Center Projects - This project will work not only with the Intelligence components of DHS, but also with CBP, ICE, TSA, Coast Guard, Secret Service and other components of DHS, to identify ways in which intelligence products are actually used in practice by DHS policymakers.

Major Products and Customers - Project deliverables will consist of the creation of working groups and production of a report or set of short reports that will: (a) propose overall guidelines for homeland security intelligence analysts focusing on counterterrorism; (b) apply recent advances in intelligence theory to generate a “tool-kit” for designing new approaches to the homeland security mission; (c) identify potential solutions to domestic intelligence challenges by studying the experiences of foreign

¹ In the FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program, 20% of the Risk Formula was for “Threat” as determined by DHS’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis. This threat component was based on an historical analysis of threats to the representative UASI cities that spanned from the attacks of September 11, 2001, and considered only federal government intelligence and investigative information (CRS Report to Congress, *The Department of Homeland Security’s Risk Assessment Methodology: Evolution, Issues, and Options for Congress*, February 2, 2007).

governments; (d) explore the counterintelligence implications of homeland security analysis; (e) produce a comparative study of state, local, and grassroots intelligence collaboration and develop recommendations for implementing “best practices;”; (f) examine ways to tailor existing intelligence community products for the specific needs of DHS; and (g) recommend ways to improve the interface with the policy community at both the federal and at the state and local levels.

Customers: DHS, Intelligence and Analysis; DHS, ICE; DHS, CBP; key domestic fusion centers and local law enforcement units (Chicago, Los Angeles, New York).

In addition, data, information, and guidance will be provided as deliverables to support threat components in other CREATE projects.

Technical Approach - The project will use an array of methods, including expert interviews, working groups, and historical case studies. Particular attention will be given to interviews at all levels of the homeland security community, including the state and municipal level as well as the federal level.

Major Milestones and Dates

- Begin roundtable series on intelligence and homeland security issues for homeland security professionals, October 2007
- Conduct initial literature survey and interviews regarding the homeland security intelligence tasks, December 2007
- Present briefing on the role of counterintelligence in the homeland security mission, January 2008
- Complete interviews with state and local officials about grassroots intelligence, March 2008
- Complete interviews with foreign officials and foreign best practices, March 2008
- Examine how best practices and proposed recommendations would work with regard to the homeland security policymaker client, June 2008
- Present initial briefings to DHS policymakers and analysts, July 2008
- Present final written products to DHS policymakers and analysts, September 2008
- Support to on-going CREATE projects through September 2008